

Attachment A

Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update - Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix - October 15, 2024

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Kitsap County Code – Title 16			
Boundary Line Adjustments (16.04.050.G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment – Delay BLA code: There needs to be more public engagement and vetted properly. Consider a BLA purpose statement and task force. Public comment – consider model ordinance. 	<p>Recommend deferral of the BLA code requirements to a future date with a broader community discussion. The County could address BLA issue during 2025 “year of the rural” as many BLA concerns relate to rural lots.</p> <p>Recommend retaining change to the definition of BLA and Building Site (KCC 16.10). Remove duplicate BLA definition.</p>	Remove and defer all proposed changes to the Boundary Line Adjustment requirements (KCC16.04.050.G), the new definition of “Building Site” (KCC 16.10.xx) and the amendment to the definition of “Boundary Line Adjustment” (KCC 16.10.xx). Also, remove duplicate BLA definition. This will allow for a more focused process involving the key stakeholders (surveyors, real estate, builders, etc.).
Land Division – location of recreation area - (KCC 16.24.040.I.3.c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment concerned with addition of adding “centrally”. 	No change recommended. Intended to ensure the open space is not remotely located in the fringes of the plat.	Amend KCC 16.24.040.I.3.c to read: c. Be <u>conveniently</u> located <u>common to all residents within the interior of the land segregation in a manner that</u> and affords good visibility of the tract from roads, sidewalks and dwellings;
Land Division – non-conforming lots for public purpose (16.04.050.J)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment concerned that this addition would preclude non-conforming lots be created for a public purpose (for example, sectioning off one acre in a RR lot for a sewer pump station). 	No change. The example pump station would be acquired by a public entity thus covered by the language.	Amend KCC 16.04.050.J to read: <u>J. A division of land made for the purpose of transferring land to a governmental entity and/or nonprofit land trust to accomplish any public purpose. The public purpose must confer a significant benefit to the general public.</u>
Kitsap County Code – Title 17			
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment throughout process has been in favor of retaining trees, and strengthening tree code, especially in favor of retaining larger (24”+ diameter) trees. Some public comment request that tree ordinance is deferred to be considered at a later date. Codes being considered are complex and many at once (CAO, PREP Program, etc.). Tree code has possibility hamper infill development and impact staff capacity. Another reason to delay is conflict with WUI Code. 	Current drafts include tree canopy retention requirements that were promoted in concept by the Board.	<p>Recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve With Amendments (See Below)

Attachment A
Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update - Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix - October 15, 2024

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495.050)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment that street trees planted along newly designed ROW internal to a new plat should count as replacement trees. 	Recommend allowing trees to count within ROW of local roads as classified by the Road Standards to count towards the requirements. Not on collectors or arterials.	Amend KCC 17.495.050 to read: B. Trees planted in public rights-of-way or areas to be dedicated as public-right-of-way <u>classified as arterials or collectors by the Kitsap County Road Standards</u> shall not count toward a <u>development's private lot's</u> existing or replacement tree unit credits. <u>Trees that are retained or replaced within local and minor collector rights-of-way are counted toward tree unit credits.</u>
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495.030.F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree units for existing trees are not adequate to act as an incentive based on the impact their preservation will have on development. Should be increased. 	Recommend creating a 36" and above category worth 5.5 units. Update 24" category to 24-35" and increase to 4.5 units. Increase grove category to 6.5 units.	Amend KCC 17.495.030.F as shown in Attachment A.
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495.030.F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deciduous replacement trees should count for 1 credit similar to a conifer replacement tree. 	Recommend increasing replacement deciduous trees to 1 (deciduous generally have larger canopies than evergreen and can assist with heat effects).	Amend KCC 17.495.030.F as shown in Attachment A.
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495.030.E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not a complete sentence 	Recommend change to <u>Diameter at breast-height (DBH) means the diameter of a tree trunk measured at 4.5 feet above average grade of the tree trunk. DBH is used in determining the diameter of existing trees.</u>	Support staff recommendation on KCC 17.495.030.E.
Tree Canopy Code (KCC 17.495.050.C.4.b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The % of trees that must be in private tracts is too high at 50%. Should be reduced. 	Recommend reducing the percentage to 25% consistent with Pierce County's requirement.	Support staff recommendation on KCC 17.495.050.C.4.b.

Attachment A
Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update - Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix - October 15, 2024

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Multifamily Open Space (KCC 17.470.070)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multifamily design standards do not have a prescriptive open space standard. The design standards discuss “usable” open space but usable is not defined. 	<p>Amend KCC 17.470.070 as shown below.</p> <p><u>A. Requirement. Open space shall be provided in or adjacent to multifamily development for all the residents of the development. For projects fifty (50) units or less, at least one open space area shall be provided. For projects, greater than fifty (50) units, two or more open spaces shall be provided. Additionally, each open space area shall:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Be of a grade and surface suitable for recreation and generally have a maximum grade of five percent, unless a steeper grade is acceptable for the activities associated with the amenity;</u> <u>2. Be located in a manner that affords good visibility of the tract from roads, sidewalks and dwellings;</u> <u>3. For external open space, have no dimensions less than thirty feet, except the width of trail segments;</u> <u>4. For external open space, be at least five hundred (500) square feet in size. For internal open space, be at least two hundred (200) square feet in size;</u> <u>5. Be accessible and convenient for year-round use to all residents within the project.</u> 	No Change to existing code language in 17.470.070
Park and Ride Impact Fee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kitsap Transit concerned with \$2,500/space impact fee for Park and Rides 	Recommend consideration of the fee in 2025 when impact fee schedule is updated.	Support staff recommendation to make no change to impact fees, and to consider in 2025

Attachment A
Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update - Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix - October 15, 2024

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Zoning and Urban Growth Area Boundaries			
Skokomish Tribe Land Use/Zoning Request PSIC-Bremerton UGA Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant initial request was to go from RP to Commercial. This was <i>not included</i> in the preferred alternative. Applicant updated request to Industrial and provided additional supporting materials. 	Recommend no change. The Industrial proposal was not reviewed in the Preferred Alternative. The property does not have a support letter from the urban services provider (Bremerton). Additionally, it is in process to potentially become federal Indian lands which, if approved, would remove County requirements in future uses.	Support staff recommendation of no change
Goldberg Land Use/Zoning Request Port Orchard UGA Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant initial request was to go from RR to UL. This was in Alt. 2 and Alt 3. But <i>not included</i> in preferred alternative. Applicant updated request from UL to UM. Both UL and UM zoning is supported by the City of Port Orchard. 	Recommend no change. The UM proposal was not reviewed in the DEIS or Preferred Alternative. The proposal would require a Developers Agreement to ensure the benefits described in the testimony. With the Plan due in December, this proposal would have an impact of scope, schedule and budget of the update. Could be recommended for future consideration.	Support staff recommendation of no change
Capital Facilities Plan			
Sewer Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add current sewer inventory map to Appendix 'A' 	Support staff recommendation on the Capital Facilities Plan as shown in Attachment B.
Transportation Revenue Tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data available - Update of estimated future (2030-2044) funding by revenue source. No change in 2024 – 2029 revenue numbers. 	Update CFP as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 3-7. Projected Transportation Grant Revenues for Capital Projects (2024 – 2044 in YOES) Exhibit 3-8. Projected Total Transportation Revenues Allocation for Capital (2024 – 2044 in YOES) Exhibit 4-92 Transportation Capital Improvement Revenue Sources (All numbers are in 2024 \$1000s) 	Support staff recommendation on the Capital Facilities Plan as shown in Attachment B.

Attachment A
Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update - Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix - October 15, 2024

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Comprehensive Plan			
Port Gamble Heritage Park Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that PGHP should not be approved until an EIS is approved • PGHP is a reference document, which is different from “adopted by reference”. 	No change. The Plan does not adopt the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Framework. It does include the impacts within the FEIS and includes a specific policy about additional wildlife and environmental review prior to planning new major projects. Any <i>adoption</i> of the Framework would be considered separately at a later date.	Support staff recommendation of no change.